



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,004	09/03/2003	Gordon Bruce Kingsley		7538

7590 10/21/2005
GBK ASSOCIATES
GORDON B. KINGSLEY
517 WOLFTREE
TRUCKEE, CA 96161

EXAMINER

PONOMARENKO, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/656,004

Applicant(s)

KINGSLEY, GORDON BRUCE

Examiner

Nicholas Ponomarenko

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the **“means for controlling kite”** (claim 3), or **“transmission of electrical, hydraulic or mechanical means”** (claim 3), must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a) The references to publications and patents listed on pages 4, 5, 9 and others must be removed from the specification and listed on form PTO-1449 in order to be considered by the examiner. See MPEP 609.

b) Statements similar to two paragraphs on page 7 are not verifiable and are irrelevant to the disclosure. Revision is recommended.

c) References, as one inserted in the text of the disclosure (see p. 9, line 8 from bottom), must be verifiable. A copy of a publication must be submitted for examiner's review and the publication must be listed on form PTO-1449. See MPEP 609.

3. The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 because it does not contain a written description of the invention with specific details on how to make or use the invention, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable a person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and the specification does not set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention. Specifically, the disclosure failed to provide information on general arrangement of the system, details of its operation, including specific control features, without which one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to built or use the claimed invention.

4. The specification **has not** been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon lack of operational details and features, which prevent utilization of the invention.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 the phrases "kite or parachute", "high or low mode", "work or other form of energy", "rope, or other means" render the claim indefinite because of the use of alternative language. Since listed phrases are not alternative words for the same concept, their use in the claim is indefinite.

In claim 1, applicant uses two different definitions for the same feature, for example, "power generation mode" and "high thrust power mode", which is confusing and is not according to PTO rules.

In claim 2 the phrase "pumps, or other" renders the claim indefinite because of the use of alternative language.

In claim 3 the phrases "chain or other means", "hydraulic or mechanical" render the claim indefinite because of the use of alternative language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. As far as they can be understood, Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Carpenter (US Patent 6,254,034). As broadly, as it can be interpreted, all claimed features are reading on the reference.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant(s) disclosure.

12. When the claims are amended, applicant(s) should state in detail where in the original disclosure or in the drawings the amended features find support. **No new matter may be introduced.**

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Ponomarenko whose telephone number is (571) 272- 2033, Fax: (571) 273-2033, or to his SPE Darren Schuberg – (571) 272-2044.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2800 Customer Service
Phone: (571) 272-2815

np
March 23, 2005



Nicholas Ponomarenko
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800